

PATENT
Patent App. Serial No.: 10/563,069
Eclipse Group Docket No. HI09038USU (P02108US)

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending and stand rejected in the present application. In the February 23, 2011 Final Office Action, the office action:

1. Provisionally rejected claims 1-17, 19 and 21 based on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 11/521,586;
2. Rejected claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11, 13, 15, 18-19, 21, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Granier* (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,399);
3. Rejected claims 2 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,399) in view of *Gao Yun* (US 2004/0203652);
4. Rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,399) in view of *Gupte et al.* (US 2002/0055350);
5. Rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* (U.S. Patent No. 6,722,399) in view of *Wu* (U.S. Patent No. 4,163,218);
6. Rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,399) in view of *Dunning et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,765,495);
7. Rejected claims 12 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,399) in view of *Taylor et al.* (US 2003/0009550);
8. Rejected claims 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,399) in view of *Caci* (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,658); and
9. Rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* (U.S. Patent No. 6,722,399) in view of *Gaudreau* (US 2003/0222782).

Applicants have cancelled claim 4 and have amended claims 1, 15, and 19. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. Claim 19 has been amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added by this response. For the reasons stated below, Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance.

PATENT
Patent App. Serial No.: 10/563,069
Eclipse Group Docket No. HI09038USU (P02108US)

1. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1–17, 19, AND 21 BASED ON NONSTATUTORY OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1–17, 19 and 21 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 11/521,586 (the '586 application). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections but have nonetheless filed a terminal disclaimer with this response to overcome the rejections. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1–17, 19, and 21.

2. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 6–9, 11, 13, 15, 18–19, 21, AND 23–24 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 6–9, 11, 13, 15, 18–19, 21, and 23–24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Granier* (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,399). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims as *Granier* does not teach or suggest each and every element recited in, at least, independent claims 1 and 15. In particular, *Granier* does not teach or suggest—as recited in claims 1 and 15—synchronizing a first portion of emergency information transmitted using a WAP data connection as a request for a URL that includes the first portion of the emergency information with a second portion of the emergency information included in a DTMF message and transmitted using a voice connection.

Because *Granier* fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in independent claims 1 and 15, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 15, as well as claims 2–14 and 16–24 that respectively depend directly or indirectly therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 6–9, 11, 13, 15, 18–19, and 23–24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

3. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2 AND 16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* in view of *Gao Yun* (US 2004/0203652).

Claims 2 and 16 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 15 respectively and are therefore in condition for allowance.

PATENT
Patent App. Serial No.: 10/563,069
Eclipse Group Docket No. HI09038USU (P02108US)

4. REJECTION OF CLAIM 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* in view of *Gupte et al.* (US 2002/0055350).

Claim 4 depends from allowable independent claim 1 and is therefore in condition for allowance.

5. REJECTION OF CLAIM 5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* in view of *Wu* (U.S. Patent No. 4,163,218).

Claim 5 depends from allowable independent claim 1 and is therefore in condition for allowance.

6. REJECTION OF CLAIM 10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* in view of *Dunning* (U.S. Patent No. 6,765,495).

Claim 10 depends from allowable independent claim 1 and is therefore in condition for allowance.

7. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12 AND 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 12 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* in view of *Taylor et al.* (US 2003/0009550).

Claims 12 and 22 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 15 respectively and are therefore in condition for allowance.

8. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 14 AND 17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* in view of *Caci* (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,658).

Claims 14 and 17 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 15 respectively and are therefore in condition for allowance.

PATENT
Patent App. Serial No.: 10/563,069
Eclipse Group Docket No. HI09038USU (P02108US)

9. REJECTION OF CLAIM 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Granier* in view of *Gaudreau* (US 2003/0222782).

Claim 20 depends from allowable independent claim 1 and is therefore in condition for allowance.

PATENT
Patent App. Serial No.: 10/563,069
Eclipse Group Docket No. HI09038USU (P02108US)

CONCLUSION

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2542. A copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: 4/25/11



Jennifer H. Hamilton
The Eclipse Group LLP
6345 Balboa Boulevard, Suite 325
Encino, CA 91316
(818) 488-8141 Telephone
(818) 332-4205 Fax
jhh@eclipsegtp.com

Customer No.: 34408

PATENT
Patent App. Serial No.: 10/563,069
Eclipse Group Docket No. HI09038USU (P02108US)

CONCLUSION

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2542. A copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: 4/25/11



Jennifer H. Hamilton
The Eclipse Group LLP
6345 Balboa Boulevard, Suite 325
Encino, CA 91316
(818) 488-8141 Telephone
(818) 332-4205 Fax
jhh@eclipsegrp.com

Customer No.: 34408